UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GOOD TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, et al.,

No. CV12-05826 PSG

Plaintiff(s),

VERDICT

MOBILEIRON, INC.,

v.

Defendant(s).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION GOOD TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION AND) GOOD TECHNOLOGY SOFTWARE, INC., Plaintiffs, ٧. MOBILEIRON, INC., Defendant.

Case No. 5:12-cv-05826-PSG

AMENDED FINAL VERDICT FORM

Case No. 5:12-cv-05826-PSG AMENDED FINAL VERDICT FORM

VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this verdict form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the jury instructions. Please refer to the jury instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

Part A. GOOD TECHNOLOGY'S FALSE ADVERTISING CLAIM

1.	Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence that
	MobileIron made a false or misleading statement of fact in a commercial
	statement about the nature or quality of Good Technology's products, services, or
	commercial activities?

Yes No

2. Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MobileIron caused the false or misleading statement to enter interstate commerce?

Yes No

If your answer to both Questions 1 and 2 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 3. If your answer to either Question 1 or 2 is "No," proceed directly to Part B.

3. Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence that any such statement was deliberately false?

Yes No

If your answer to Question 3 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 4. If your answer to Question 3 is "No," proceed directly to Question 5.

4. Has MobileIron shown there is evidence that the false statement did not deceive a substantial segment of MobileIron or Good Technology's consumers and that there is evidence that the false statement did not likely influence the purchasing decisions of these consumers?

Yes No

If your answer to Question 4 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 5. If your answer to Question 4 is "No," proceed directly to Question 7.

1	5. Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence both that the false or misleading statement actually deceived or had a tendency to deceive a
2	substantial segment of MobileIron or Good Technology's consumers and that the false or misleading statement likely influenced the purchasing decisions of these
3	consumers?
4	Yes No
5	
6	If your answer to Question 5 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 6. If your answer to Question 5 is "No," proceed directly to Part B.
7	6. Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the false
8	or misleading statement caused Good Technology to be damaged by a diversion of sales or loss of goodwill?
9	of sales of loss of goodwin:
10	Yes No
11	If your answer to Question 6 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 7. If your answer to
12	Question 6 is "No," proceed directly to Part B.
13	7. What amount of damages has Good Technology proven are attributable to MobileIron's false or misleading statement?
14	
15	Total Damages: \$
16	8. Has MobileIron proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Good Technology made false or misleading representations related to the subject matter
17	of its false advertising claim to an extent that it would be unfair to allow Good Technology to enforce its claim?
18	recimology to emoree its claim:
19	Yes No
20	Please proceed to Part B.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Part B. INFRINGEMENT OF GOOD TECHNOLOGY'S PATENTS

Direct Infringement

9. Has Good Technology proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MobileIron's use or sale directly infringes the asserted claims of Good Technology's patents?

For each claim and accused product, please place a check under either 'YES' (in favor of Good Technology) or 'NO' (in favor of MobileIron).

Asserted Claims (as		ron Corce SP)		ron Cloud vware)
'219 patent	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 9		X		X,
Claim 14		X ,		X
Claim 18		X.		X /
Claim 23*		X		X
'322 patent	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 1		χ/		X
Claim 12		X		X
'386 patent	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 8		X /		ΑV
Claim 9		X		X

* Note: For the above table, you can only find claim 23 of the '219 patent infringed if you already found claim 18 infringed.

If you have found that MobileIron infringed a valid claim of Good Technology's '386 patent, proceed to Question 10. Otherwise, please proceed directly to Part C.

Special Findings on Infringement Relating to Good Technology's '386 Patent

10. If you have found that MobileIron infringed a valid claim of Good	
Technology's '386 patent, upon what feature or functionality did you base	you
finding? [Check all that apply.]	

 Root Detection (Android)		
Out of Contact VSP (Android/iOS)		
Out of Contact Anyware (iOS)		

Please proceed to Part C.

Part C. INVALIDITY OF GOOD TECHNOLOGY'S PATENTS

Invalidity Based On Prior Art

11. Has MobileIron proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following asserted claims of Good Technology's patents are invalid as anticipated?

For each claim, please place a check next to either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

Asserted Claims		
'219 patent	YES	NO
Claim 9		X.
Claim 14		X.
Claim 18*		X,
Claim 23		X X
'322 patent	YES	NO
Claim I		χV
Claim 12		X
'386 patent	YES	NO
Claim 8)X(r
Claim 9		T V

Note: For the above table, if you find claim 23 of the '219 patent invalid, you must also find claim 18 invalid.

12. Has MobileIron proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following asserted claims of Good Technology's patents are invalid as obvious?

For each claim, please place a check next to either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

a Asserted Claims		
'219 patent	YES	NO
Claim 9	X/	
Claim 14	X	
Claim 18*	X	
Claim 23	X	
'322 patent	YES	NO
Claim 1		X ∕
Claim 12		X
'386 patent	YES	NO
Claim 8	X /	
Claim 9	X	

Note: For the above table, if you find claim 23 of the '219 patent invalid, you must also find claim 18 invalid.

Invalidity Based On Written Description

13. Has MobileIron proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following asserted claims of Good Technology's patents are invalid for lacking an adequate written description of the claimed invention?

For each claim, please place a check next to either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

-Asserted Claims		
'386 patent	YES	NO
Claim 8	. <u> </u>	X.
Claim 9		X

If your answer to Question 9 is "No" as to <u>all</u> claims, please proceed to Part E. If <u>all</u> claims are invalidated by your answers to Questions 11, 12 or 13 (or any combination thereof), please proceed to Part E. Otherwise, please proceed to Part D.

Part D.	DAMAGES	ON COOR	TECHNOT	OOME D	THEFT
Part D.	DAMAGES	ON GOOD	IECHNOL	OGY'S PA	ATENTS

. 14. ar	What has Good Technology proven it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for ny infringement of Good Technology's patents?
	Total Royalty: \$
15. fo	What type of royalty has Good Technology proven that it is entitled to, if any, or any infringement of Good Technology's patents?
	One-time payment (lump sum)
	Running royalty
Please proceed to Pa	art E.
Part E.	INFRINGEMENT OF MOBILEIRON'S '016 PATENT
Dire	ct Infringement

16. Has MobileIron proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Good Technology's use or sale directly infringe the asserted claims of the MobileIron patent?

For each claim, please place a check under either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

Asserted Claims			
'016 patent	YES	No	
Claim 1		X	
Claim 3*		X	
Claim 4		X	
Claim 15		X	
Claim 16*		X	
Claim 18*		X -	

* Note: For the above table, you can only find claims 3 and 4 infringed if you already found claim 1 infringed. Similarly, you can only find claims 16 and 18 infringed if you already found claim 15 infringed.

Induced Infringement

- 17. Has MobileIron proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each of the following requirements is met and that each occurred after March 1, 2013:
 - a) acts are actually carried out by Good Technology's customers that directly infringe one or more claims of MobileIron's patent;
 - b) Good Technology knowingly took action specifically intending to cause the infringing acts by its customers;
 - c) Good Technology was aware of the MobileIron patent; and
 - d) Good Technology knew that the acts, if taken, would constitute infringement of that patent, or Good Technology believed there was a high probability that the acts, if taken, would constitute infringement of the MobileIron patent but deliberately avoided confirming that belief?

For each claim, please place a check under either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

Asserted Claims		
'016 patent	YES	NO
Claim 1		X _x
Claim 3°		X,
Claim 4*		X
Claim 15		Ky.
Claim 16*		λý
Claim 18*		X

* Note: For the above table, you can only find claims 3 and 4 infringed if you already found claim 1 infringed. Similarly, you can only find claims 16 and 18 infringed if you already found claim 15 infringed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Contributory Infringement

- 18. Has MobileIron proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each of the following requirements is met and that each occurred after March 1, 2013:
 - a) direct infringement of MobileIron's patent by a Good Technology customer;
 - b) Good Technology sells, offers to sell, or imports within the United States a component that is used to practice an asserted claim:
 - c) the component constitutes a material part of the claimed invention;
 - d) the component has no substantial, noninfringing use; and
 - e) Good Technology was aware of the patent and knew that there was no substantial, noninfringing use for the component?

For each claim, please place a check under either 'YES' (in favor of MobileIron) or 'NO' (in favor of Good Technology).

Asserted Claims	and the second second second	
'016 patent	YES	NO
Claim 1		X.
Claim 3		X
Claim 4*		X
Claim 15		X.
Claim 16*		W
Claim 18*		X

Note: For the above table, you can only find claims 3 and 4 infringed if you already found claim 1 infringed. Similarly, you can only find claims 16 and 18 infringed if you already found claim 15 infringed.

Please proceed to Part F.

5

Part F. INVALIDITY OF MOBILEIRON'S '016 PATENT

Invalidity Based On Prior Art

19. Has Good Technology proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following asserted claims of MobileIron's patent are invalid as anticipated?

For each claim, please place a check next to either 'YES' (in favor of Good Technology) or 'NO' (in favor of MobileIron).

Asserted Claims		
'016 patent	YES	NO
Claim 1*		X,
Claim 3		X
Claim 4		λ
Claim 15*		X,
Claim 16		X
Claim 18		X

* Note: For the above table, if you find claim 3 or 4 invalid, you must also find claim 1 invalid. Similarly, if you find claim 16 or 18 invalid, you must also find claim 15 invalid.

20. Has Good Technology proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the
following asserted claims of MobileIron's patent are invalid as obvious?

For each claim, please place a check next to either 'YES' (in favor of Good Technology) or 'NO' (in favor of MobileIron).

Asserted Claims		
'016 patent	YES	NO
Claim 1*		X
Claim 3		X,
Claim 4		X
Claim 15*		×
Claim 16		X X
Claim 18		¥

* Note: For the above table, if you find claim 3 or 4 invalid, you must also find claim 1 invalid. Similarly, if you find claim 16 or 18 invalid, you must also find claim 15 invalid.

If your answer to Questions 16, 17 and 18 is "No" as to <u>all</u> claims, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the foreperson sign and date this form. If <u>all</u> claims are invalidated by your answers to Questions 19 or 20 (or any combination thereof), stop here, answer no further questions, and have the foreperson sign and date this form. Otherwise, please proceed to Part G.

Part G. DAMAGES ON MOBILEIRON'S '016 PATENT

21. What has MobileIron proven it is entitled to as a reasonable royal	y for	anv
infringement of MobileIron's patent?	•	

Total Royalty: \$_____

22. What type of royalty has MobileIron proven that it is entitled to, if any, for any infringement of MobileIron's patents?

One-time payment (lump sum)

Running royalty

Dated: Chagaist 4,2015

PRESIDING JUROR

PRESIDING JUROR

After this verdict form has been signed and dated, notify the court that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 31, 2015

PAUL S. GREWAL United States Magistrate Judge